THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

19 June 1997

AM 10:00 CONVENE, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes:

22 May 1997

B. Dates of next meetings:

24 July 1997
18 September 1997

II. SUBMISSION AND REVIEWS

A. Washington Convention Center Authority

CFA 19/JUN/97-1, New Convention Center. Mount Vernon Square between 7th and 9th streets and Mount Vernon Square Place and N Street. Design development. Concept review. (Previous: CFA 22/MAY/97-2.)

B. National Park Service

1. CFA 19/JUN/97-2, The White House. Periphery security measures adjacent to grounds of Sherman Memorial and First Division Memorial. Design development. (Previous: CFA 22/MAY/97-1.)

2. CFA 19/JUN/97-3, The Occidental Grill. 1475 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (Former PADC area.) Sidewalk cafe.

C. Department of State

1. CFA 19/JUN/97-4, Chancery for the Government of Ethiopia. International Center, Lot 5. Conceptual.

2. CFA 19/JUN/97-5, Chancery for the Government of Brunei. International Center, Lot 18. Conceptual.

3. CFA 19/JUN/97-6, Chancery for the Government of the United Arab Emirates. International Center, Lot 19. Conceptual.

D. Department of Defense

CFA 19/JUN/97-7, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. 450 E Street, N.W., Judiciary Square.

1. Landscape renovation. Design.

2. Security cameras. Proposal.

E. Department of the Treasury

CFA 19/JUN/97-8, U.S. Mint. Robert F. Kennedy commemorative one dollar silver coin. Design.

F. General Services Administration

CFA 19/JUN/97-9, Main Auditor's Building. Independence Avenue and 14th Street, S.W. Site improvements.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS continued, 19 June 1997

G. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 97-98, Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School. 1524 35th Street, N.W. New performing arts and physical education centers. Permit. (Previous: O.G. 96-95. Concept reviewed and approved by CFA 19 September 1996.)

b. Appendix I.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 97-52, Watergate Office Building. 600 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Ventilation louvers for new cooling equipment at grade. Conceptual.

b. Appendix II.

III. INSPECTION

Freer Gallery of Art - Inspection of objects proposed for acquisition.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-81 HPA. 97-195	3220 O Street, N.W. Lotta Chi Morrone's Italian Ice	Alterations, awning and sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 5 June 1997 which indicate the removal of the existing display window, the addition of shed-type awnings along the front face of building and over side window and a 3'-0" by 2'-6" sidewall sign reading "Morrone's Italian Ice". Lettering on awning is limited to 12" valance on front awning ONLY. No objection to proposed lighting as indicated in supplemental information received and dated 19 June 1997.

O.G. 97-88 HPA. 97-222	3014-3020 Dent Place, N.W. Abaris Realty Condominiums	Fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed locations and design of wood fence which is to be stained grey.

O.G. 97-89 HPA. 97-225	3200 M Street, N.W. Kathryn L. Inglesby, TTEE Banana Republic	Addition of stair enclosure at roof level - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, including the addition of a stair enclosure on the roof of the two story portion of the existing structure. Working drawings conform to approved concept design and previous recommendations. See previous Action (O.G. 96-111). There is no objection to the proposed replacement of windows, PROVIDED the replacements comply with the supplemental working drawings received and dated June 1997 which indicate replication of existing window detailing.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-90 HPA. 97-226	3295 M Street, N.W. Woodward Brothers/ Rhino	Alterations to storefront - conceptual

ACTION: No objection to concept design for proposed storefront alterations as shown in "Concept B" of supplemental drawings received and dated 11 June 1997, which indicate smaller signs reading "Rhino" in wood paneling over each pair of windows at either side of entrance. Submit working drawings with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 97-91 HPA. 97-228	3249 O Street, N.W. Henry and Betsy Werronen Residence	Fence - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed wood fence consisting of 1 x 6 inch vertical boards.

O.G. 97-92 HPA. 97-229	2918 P Street, N.W. Estate of Audry Auchincloss	Alley wall with garage doors - permit

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed work is not visible from public space, as alley is a private alley. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

O.G. 97-95 HPA. 97-232	3404 R Street, N.W. Residence	Alterations for roof deck - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Proposed work is not visible from public space. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-96 HPA. 97-233	1405 34th Street, N.W. Bryan Residence	Alterations to rear porch - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case was withdrawn by written request of applicant. Note is made that property holds an easement with the Foundation for the Preservation of Historic Georgetown. Submit new paperwork for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 97-97 HPA. 97-234	3412 P Street, N.W. Wayne Smith Residence	Alterations to rear - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for alterations to rear of the house. Working drawings conform to approved concept design. See previous Action (O.G. 97-71).

O.G. 97-99 HPA. 97-236	1530 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. The Historic George Town Club	Canopy over entrance stairs and sign - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed canopy over entrance stair with lettering reading "The Historic George Town Club" on face of canopy as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated June 1997. Canopy will be 5'-3" wide and have a vertical dimension of 1'-6" plus a 6" valance as shown in construction drawings. Working drawings conform to previous recommendations for approved design. See previous Action (O.G. 95-147). Recommend applicant address the treatment of the corner bay windows that have been boarded up for an extended period of time.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-100 HPA. 97-239	1633 29th Street, N.W. Mackall Square Johns Residence	Alterations to driveway - conceptual

ACTION: Returned without Action. Case superseded by case O.G. 97-101.

O.G. 97-103 HPA. 97-263	3123 Dumbarton Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. Rafshoon Residence	Repair stone retaining wall - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement-in-kind of stone retaining wall along sidewalk. Proposed work is repair and maintenance to match existing. Existing wall has collapsed. Existing stone will be reused in new retaining wall.

STATUS REPORT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-44 HPA. 97-102	2733 P Street, N.W. William Kappaz Residence	Third floor addition on rear - conceptual

STATUS: On HOLD for Old Georgetown Board meeting 10 July 1997 for further discussion at the request of the applicant.

O.G. 97-76 HPA. 97-190	3061 M Street, N.W. The Levy Group World Watch International	Alterations to storefront - conceptual

STATUS: On HOLD for Old Georgetown Board meeting 10 July 1997 for further discussion with applicant.

O.G. 97-83 HPA. 97-212	1421 37th Street, N.W. Georgetown University Poulton Hall	Emergency generator and enclosure - conceptual

STATUS: On HOLD for Old Georgetown Board meeting 10 July 1997 for further discussion with applicant.

O.G. 97-85 HPA. 97-216	1319 30th Street, N.W. Meda Mladek Residence	Addition to rear second and third floors - conceptual

STATUS: On HOLD for Old Georgetown Board meeting 10 July 1997 for further discussion with applicant.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-93 HPA. 97-230	3333 P Street, N.W. Thomas Rutherford Residence	Addition of third floor - conceptual

STATUS: On HOLD for Old Georgetown Board meeting 10 July 1997 for further review with applicant.

O.G. 97-94 HPA. 97-231	3210 R Street, N.W. Residence	Addition of 3rd floor and rear conservatory - conceptual

STATUS: On HOLD for Old Georgetown Board meeting 10 July 1997 for further review with applicant.

O.G. 97-101 HPA. 97-257	1633 29th Street, N.W. Mackall Square Johns Residence	Alterations to driveway - permit

STATUS: On HOLD for Old Georgetown Board meeting 10 July 1997 for further review with applicant.

ADDENDUM

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-89 HPA. 97-225	3200 M Street, N.W. Kathryn L. Inglesby, TTEE Banana Republic	Addition of stair enclosure at roof level - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, including the addition of a stair enclosure on the roof of the two story portion of the existing structure. Working drawings conform to approved concept design and previous recommendations. See previous Action (O.G. 96-111). There is no objection to the proposed replacement of windows, PROVIDED the replacements comply with the supplemental working drawings received and dated 30 June 1997 which indicate replication of existing window detailing. Submit sample of replacement window for review prior to installation.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 97-50	5300 27th Street, N.W. Kennard and Kennedy Residence	Alterations to rear and new steps - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to two rear window openings for new french doors or to new masonry steps at same two locations. Materials of steps and detailing of brick moulding around the new openings will match existing elsewhere on residence.

S.L. 97-51	600 Maryland Avenue, S.W. American Farm Bureau Federation	A/C units on roof - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed installation of rooftop air-handling-units as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 11 June 1997. Units are no taller than 63 inches high, which will limit visibility from public space. Coordinate location of units with landlord and other tenants doing additional work on roof. See previous Action for the USDA Graduate School penthouse (S.L. 97-47).

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS PRE-MEETING TOUR

19 June 1997

CONVENE: 9:00 AM, Pension Building, Suite 312,
441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

1. International Center, Van Ness Street at Connecticut Avenue. Tour of Center and inspection of sites for two new chanceries.

2. Proposed Convention Center, Mount Vernon Square and N Street between 7th and 9th streets.

Members Present:	J. Carter Brown, Chairman Carolyn Brody Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel Ann Todd Free Eden Rafshoon
Staff Present:	Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Jeffrey R. Carson Sue A. Kohler Jose Martinez-Canino

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

19 June 1997

The meeting was convened at 10:35 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices in the Pension Building, 441 F Street, N.W., after a tour of project sites.

Members present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Carolyn Brody Hon. Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel Hon. Ann Todd Free Hon. Eden Rafshoon
Staff present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Mr. José Martínez-Canino
National Capital Planning Commission staff present:	Mr. James Russell

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes for the 22 May meeting. The minutes were approved without objection.

B. Dates of next meetings were approved as:

24 July 1997
18 September 1997

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. Washington Convention Center Authority

CFA 19/JUN/97-1, New Convention Center. Mount Vernon Square between 7th and 9th streets and Mount Vernon Square Place and N Street, N.W. Design development. Concept review. (Previous: CFA 22/MAY/97-2.) Staff member Jeffrey Carson introduced Allen Lew from the Convention Center Authority. Mr. Lew said the design was progressing and a number of meetings had been held with various groups with an interest in the Center, as well as with the NCPC staff. He

said they were to meet with the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation in the afternoon and were at this time seeking Commission of Fine Arts approval of their concept design. He asked Marshall Purnell from Devrouax & Purnell to talk about the design elements of the Center that had been under study since the Commission last saw the design.

Mr. Purnell said his group had been studying the elements that continued to concern the Commission: the south facade, ballroom roof, treatment of L and M streets, sight lines from the Old Patent Office, and the choice of materials. He began by showing a sight-line drawing and pointing out that the Carnegie Library would obscure much of the building from the steps of the Old Patent Office, and as one moved closer even less would be seen. Turning to the materials, he said they had brought samples which would be discussed later, but he wanted to point out the clarity of the glass and the amount of glass used on the side facades. He then asked Thomas Ventulett to discuss the south facade.

Mr. Ventulett said the concave form in the center had been kept, but the corners had been modified somewhat to define the edge of Mount Vernon Square, while still retaining a transparent quality; the solid piers had also been moved in farther toward the center. The recessed entrance had been widened to reflect the full width of 8th street; pylons had been added at either side, and there was a clear glass canopy to provide protection for those waiting for taxis. Mr. Ventulett also pointed out a raised skylight that marked the 8th Street axis, a circular one at the L Street bridge, and smaller ones placed at intervals over the south facade. He thought the skylights would add to the transparency of the building and make it more welcoming. He noted also that in all parts of the building there would be views to the outside, so that orientation would not be a problem. Mr. Purnell added that there would be food service establishments along the central section of the south facade and that this retail activity would be defined by a projecting element 20 feet above the sidewalk; above this would rise the curved section of the facade. The Chairman thought this was a great help, that the lowering of this element from its previous height would make the old Carnegie library look higher; similarily, moving the solid masses in from the corners had made the convention center facade look smaller. He also thought the thin pylons flanking the entrance had helped emphasize the 8th Street axis, and that moving the ballroom roof back was an improvement. He liked the concept of the skylights, particularly the new raised one, but he wondered if it might look better if it were circular, like the one at L Street; he asked the architects to give it some thought. Lastly, he commented on the concave curve of the facade, saying that he found it a very successful way to emphasize a major entrance

and welcome people into the building. He recalled the succession of curvilinear forms along the 8th Street axis, from the Hirshhorn Museum up through the Navy Memorial. He liked the friendliness of the building, a building too large for the neighborhood to be sure, but one that would play an important role in the survival of the city. Given the problems, he complimented the architects on the degree of sophistication of the solution.

Ms. Diamonstein asked about the development of the 7th and 9th street facades. Mr. Purnell said they continued to be related to the residential scale of the streets, with a 30-foot grid being used for the fenestration pattern; he thought the large amount of glass would help make these facades more friendly to the neighborhood, making it possible for the residents to see inside and watch convention activity, and for convention visitors to retain contact with the city outside. Mr. Purnell answered Ms. Diamonstein's questions about several new elements on these facades, and then asked Mr. Ventulett to discuss building materials and show samples.

Mr. Ventulett said the base of the building would be granite, with limestone above, and brick would be used on the side facades; it would be a somewhat darker, greyer color than the limestone. The glass would be almost clear. He showed samples, and there was a discussion about the color of the granite and brick, with Ms. Diamonstein concerned that the granite might be too grey-black for the warm tone of the brick; she also asked if there would be any decorative details in the brick. Mr. Ventulett said there would be something, but he had not worked out anything at this point. In regard to the granite color, he said they would continue to study it. The Chairman commented on the use of brick to bring down the scale, saying he was not sure it always worked, especially if the brick unit was an ordinary domestic size. He suggested studying Roman brick, which had been used very successfully on monumental buildings, and he told Mr. Ventulett the Commission would want to follow the material selections carefully and see mockups on the site.

Mrs. Rafshoon asked if the 7th and 9th street sidewalks were wide enough for landscaping; Mr. Ventulett said they were, and they would have new street trees. Mrs. Free asked about parking for the residents, and Mr. Purnell said there would be zones just for them, and plenty of parking in neighborhood garages for convention center visitors. Ms. Diamonstein asked about lighting and signage; Mr. Ventulett said he would bring those items in later. She also asked about delivery of food and disposal of garbage and trash, and at the Chairman's request, Mr. Purnell went through the whole loading and unloading procedure.

There were no more questions, and by vote, the members agreed unanimously to approve the concept design. Exhibit A

B. National Park Service

1. CFA 19/JUN/97-2, The White House. Periphery security measures adjacent to grounds of Sherman Memorial and First Division Memorial. Design development. (Previous: CFA 22/MAY/97-2.) Mr. Carson reviewed the project as previously presented and the four elements that had concerned the Commission: (1) the color of the granite for the retaining walls; (2) how to close temporarily one section of East Executive Avenue; (3) how to treat the corners of 17th Street in a more open manner, rather than using a stone wall; and (4) a request to see the actual design proposed for the guardhouses. He then introduced James McDaniel from the Park Service's White House Liaison Office. Mr. McDaniel said they had come up with some alternatives to the wall and bollard plan and the granite color that he hoped would address the Commission's concerns. He asked Dennis Strah to discuss them.

Mr. Strah first discussed the temporary barrier off E Street. He said the proposal for a Jersey barrier with a stone facing had been replaced by a series of rectangular planters, much like those in use on Pennsylvania Avenue; he said he would work with the Secret Service to make sure their requirements were met.

Secondly, Mr. Strah said the extent and height of the granite walls at 17th and E streets had been reduced. He showed a drawing for the installation, where a low, 12-inch-high curved wall at the corner with bollards above it had replaced the 3-foot-high wall seen previously; he thought this would be less tiring than a continuous row of bollards, which the Commission had suggested. This scheme would be repeated at State and E and in other locations where the higher walls had been shown before.

Thirdly, Mr. Strah showed granite samples similar to those in the Sherman Memorial area, Lafayette Park, and other places in the area. The Chairman suggested, and the other members agreed, that a choice should be made among the darker grey samples shown.

Mr. McDaniel said they would like to bring the guardhouse design in as a separate submission when they were closer to a final design. The Chairman suggested they take a look at the guardhouses designed by Pei Cobb Freed for the Ronald Reagan Building.

The Chairman and Mr. McDaniel then discussed the

Pennsylvania Avenue closing and the security measures that had been taken. Mr. McDaniel said the Park Service's interim improvements had been completed, although in answer to the Chairman's questions, he said the two north corners, at Jackson and Madison places, still had Jersey barriers, and Pennsylvania Avenue remained an empty paved street. He said a design for the north corners was being worked on and would be similar to that on the Avenue; he said it would be submitted to the Commission.

The revised designs for the periphery security measures were then unanimously approved, with the guardhouse design to be submitted later. Exhibit B

1. CFA 19/JUN/97-3, Occidental Grill. 1475 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (Former PADC area.) Sidewalk cafe. Mr. Carson pointed out the location of the grill, next to the Willard Hotel, and noted that it had been in the PADC area; after the demise of that organization, the sidewalk areas had been taken over by the Park Service, hence the submission by that agency. He said the submission was simply for tables, chairs, and planters in white, with green umbrellas, and then introduced Michael Fonseca, the attorney for the Occidental Grill.

Mr. Fonseca said there would be twenty tables with the planters placed around the perimeter, and the installation would be seasonal. Ms. Diamonstein thought the white color was too intrusive and suggested a black-green. The other members, however, had no objection to the white, and the installation with white furniture and planters was approved by a majority vote.

C. Department of State

1. CFA 19/JUN/97-4, Chancery for the Government of Ethiopia. International Center, Lot 5. Conceptual. Staff member José Martínez said this was the first of three embassy designs to be submitted, and he noted that the members had seen all three sites on their pre-meeting tour. He introduced Herb Johnson from the Department of State.

Mr. Johnson gave a brief history of the International Center for the benefit of the newer members. He said it had been created about twenty-seven years ago to enable foreign governments to build chanceries on prime property without encountering the difficulties experienced in moving into residential neighborhoods or leasing suitable space in downtown buildings. Mr. Johnson said the Center consisted of twenty-one building lots on twenty-seven acres, with the lots being leased for ninety-nine years with an option to renew for another ninety-nine. He said all lots except one had been

leased, and he expected the Commission would see at least six building designs during the remainder of the year.

Mr. Johnson gave the members a preview of the designs to be presented at this meeting, noting that the Brunei and Ethiopia designs were by the same architect, Ron Henderer from RTKL. He asked Mr. Henderer to present the design for the Ethiopian chancery first.

Mr. Henderer said the building was sited at the top of a steep slope, with a 50-foot drop in grade, creating a very dramatic site. He talked about the country, its arid climate, its ancient and diverse culture, and its architecture, showing photographs of churches carved out of steep cliffs and stele over 100-feet high. He said these were some of the things he had in mind when he was developing the design for the chancery.

Using a model and renderings, Mr. Henderer explained his design. He talked first about what he called the wall of representation, a wall that would go through the site from International Drive to the steep hillside. It would be made of stone, and at selected places there would be reliefs carved into it that would depict the rich diversity of Ethiopia's culture. Three would be seen from the outside and would be much larger than the others. The visitor would see the smaller reliefs as he entered the embasssy and walked up a glass-enclosed monumental staircase to the upper floors. Connected to the main part of the embassy by the stair hall was the second principal element in the design: a half-cylinder form, remininscent of the round Ethiopian house. In this space many of the special functions of the embassy would take place; the top floor would be reserved for the ambassador's suite. Mr. Henderer said they were not sure yet what modern material would be used to interpret this traditionally light wood or reed structure, but it would harmonize in color with the stone of the wall. There would also be a two-story multi-purpose hall, entered from the ground floor, for dinners, lectures and other similar functions. The Chairman asked Mr. Henderer what plans had been made to keep the western sun out of the half-cylinder building. Mr. Henderer said there were a number of mature trees on the site that would shade the building nicely, and he was working to see that as many were saved as possible.

There were no further questions, and the concept design was unanimously approved, with design development and material samples to be seen later. Exhibit C

2. CFA 19/JUN/97-5, Chancery for the Government of Brunei. International Center, Lot 18. Conceptual. Mr. Henderer then discussed the design for the chancery of Brunei.

He gave the members background information on the country, saying that its six-hundred-year-old monarchy was the oldest continuous monarchy in existence. The small Muslim country--about the size of Delaware--on the northwest coast of Borneo was formerly a British protectorate. He said the climate was tropical and the population small, only about 210,000. the typical architecture was the Malay, or water house, built on stilts and skeletal in nature, with a simple gable roof. Public functions took place on the front porch or in the great room beyond, with private family functions relegated to the rear.

Mr. Henderer showed a model and renderings of his design. It was a building closely resembling a Malay House, set above a reflecting pool, surrounded by a garden with decorative paving. The pool would reflect south light into the building. Construction would be very light, and much of the wall area would be glass; there would be an overhanging stainless steel roof. The interior design featured a three-story-high great room and a glass cube ceremonial conference room which would face the Reno Road side of the property.

Landscape architect Andrea Maine described the garden as a series of layered planes, echoing the architect's organization of the structure. She talked about the surrounding serpentine wall which, depending on the grade, could be a retaining wall, screen wall or seat wall. It would contain plantings and artifacts, and at one point would become part of a "cascading" stairway with a series of level landings that would allow passage from the building down to the garden. Plant material would be selected with the idea of translucency and for the reflective quality of the leaves. Small specimen trees would be surrounded by polished slabs of granite to further the feeling of reflectivity associated with water. Larger trees would be placed around the site as necessary for their screening effect.

The Commission was pleased with the concept design and approved it unanimously, with design development and material samples to be seen later. Exhibit C

3. CFA 19/JUN/97-6, Chancery for the Government of the United Arab Emirates. International Center, Lot 19. Conceptual. Mr. Angelos Demetriou was introduced as the architect for this chancery. He said that he, too, had attemped to bring something of the spirit of the people and the country into his design, a revised version of his competition design. He showed drawings of a building with facades of ash-white granite panels joined by stainless steel spacers. He said the entire design, exterior and interior, was developed using these panels as a module; the design was based on a highly-regulated Islamic tradition, seen in the

geometry of palaces, mosques, and gardens, where there was a central space with everything else ordered symmetrically around that space. And so he had begun with the four-story central hall, which featured a curving staircase and a filigree glass dome. The columns would be aluminum, an attempt to keep the spirit of Islam but cast it in modern materials. There would be a grand banquet hall in the Islamic style, and a mosque; other spaces would be typical of a chancery building.

Ms. Diamonstein had some questions about the various facades, the parking and service, and the location of the mechanical equipment. There were no objections to the revised design concept, however, and it was unanimously approved. Exhibit C

D. Department of Defense

CFA 19/JUN/97-7, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. 450 E Street, N.W., Judiciary Square. Landscape renovation design and proposal for security cameras. Mr. Carson said this building was one of a pair flanking the old Hadfield courthouse in the Judiciary Square Historic District; he said the buildings were designed by noted Washington architect Nathan Wyeth in the 1930s. The proposal was to relandscape the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (on the west side of the Square) and, in response to a recent break-in, install security cameras. Mr. Carson commented also on the incongruous split-rail fencing on the grounds, saying that it was his understanding that the courts would be removing it and, perhaps at a later date, installing a metal bollard and chain system. He then introduced the administrative officer of the court, Robert Bieber.

Mr. Bieber said the court's main concern was to increase the security around the building, and that would involve consideration of where to put the security cameras. He then commented on the condition of the landscaping, which had had no attention for many years; he said they would like to upgrade it so that it would complement the Law Enforcement Officer's Memorial across the street as well as the other buildings on the Square, but at the same time not interfere with security camera views of the area. He asked horticulturist Darryl Kosisky to discuss the landscaping first.

Mr. Kosisky said he had been receiving complaints about the appearance of the landscaping for fifteen years but had just recently received funding to do something about it. He said that, lacking any early site plans or photographs, they would keep the existing planting beds and replace existing trees and shrubs with like species. They would also be

planting flowers to add a touch of color during the summer months.

Mr. Bieber then turned to the security camera proposal. He said there were various options as far as location and kind of camera mounting were concerned, and they had been searching for something that was fairly temporary and could by removed without destroying the limestone of the building. He asked Ray Barron from the Defense Department's Defense Protective Service to discuss the options.

Mr. Barron said his recommendation would be to install cameras at the top of the building at the corners, behind the parapet, so there would be no damage to the stone. He distributed booklets to the members showing the various types of installation and pointed out his preference, noting that the cameras could also be mounted on poles outside the building with additional expense. Mr. Barron said he had attended a meeting with Mr. Carson at which the problem of security cameras on historic buildings had been discussed, but no ideal solution had been offered.

The Chairman asked if the judges were comfortable with Mr. Barron's proposal, and he said they were. Mr. Carson asked about the size of the camera and was told it was 19 by 15 inches and weighed 22 pounds. The Chairman asked if it was expected that these cameras would be available in a much smaller size in the near future. Mr. Carson said the Mall Streetscape Workshop had been investigating this and had found a prototype in use that was small enough to be attached to the collar of street lamps. The Chairman thought that since the staff was watching this development so closely, the proposed installation could be approved on an interim basis, but he said he would hate to see a precedent set for using this large camera on every government office building. Mrs. Free asked about the color--beige or stainless steel--and if the arm would be black. The Chairman said he thought beige would be better because the steel would pick up the sun, and he did not think a black arm would be acceptable. Mr. Barron said the arm could be beige also. On that basis, the Commission agreed unanimously to approve the cameras on an interim basis. Exhibit D

Before a lunch break was called, the Secretary asked to bring up the question of restoration of the Darlington Fountain, by sculptor Paul Jennewein, at the rear of the court building. He recalled that he had been working on this project for several years and said that the Park Service had recently offered their consulting services on it. Their recommendation, however, was that it be regilded, and he felt strongly that it should have the same polished bronze patina seen on a second version in South Carolina's Brookgreen

Gardens. He said it would be easier to do, he thought it would look better, and he hoped the Commission would back him in pressing for this kind of finish. There were no objections, and Mr. Atherton thanked the Commission; he said it was a shame the way the statue had been neglected for so many years.

(The Commission recessed for lunch at 12:45 p.m. and reconvened at 1:25 p.m.)

E. Department of the Treasury

CFA 19/JUN/97-8, U.S. Mint. Robert F. Kennedy commemorative one dollar silver coin. Design. Staff member Sue Kohler passed out designs and "pseudo-coins" for this commemorative issue. She said there had been a number of designs for the portrait on the obverse, as well as for the reverse, for which the subject matter had not been specified. She recalled that the members had received a selection of these in their pre-meeting packages, and she said that after review by the Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee, the Kennedy Memorial, and the Kennedy family, one obverse and two reverse designs remained in the running.

She showed the preferred portrait for the obverse and then a portrait of Senator Kennedy by C. J. Fox, on which it had been based. She said the family hoped to get the portrait on the coin to look more like the Fox version. The members agreed that further study was needed, although in general they preferred this portrait to others they had seen.

Mrs. Kohler then showed the two reverse designs. The first, which was favored by the Citizens Coin Committee, showed the seals of the Department of Justice and the Senate, to symbolize Kennedy's two most important positions in the government. The one preferred by the family featured a long quotation, a half-length portrait, and depictions of the Capitol and the flag. There was unanimous agreement that the one with the seals was much better because there were too many elements in the other and the inscription was too long to be read easily at coin size.

Mrs. Kohler introduced Manjula Pindiprolu from the Mint, and sculptor/engravers Thomas Rogers, who designed the obverse, and Jim Peed, the designer of the reverse showing the seals. She said they would be able to answer any questions the members might have. The Chairman said he thought it was a clear-cut decision, and he thought the Commission needed to see the plaster model for the portrait, because there would be no way of knowing how it would look on the coin by inspecting another line drawing. Ms. Manjula was asked to convey this to the Mint.

The concept design for the reverse showing the two seals was then approved, and the concept design for the obverse was also approved, contingent on Commission review of the plaster model. Exhibit E

F. General Services Administration

CFA 19/JUN/97-9, Main Auditor's Building. Independence Avenue and 14th Street, S.W. Site improvements. Mr. Martínez noted that the members had driven by the building during their pre-meeting tour. He said the site improvements would be on the south, between the building and the Holocaust Museum, and would consist of paving the area between the two buildings for shared parking, erecting a guard booth, and landscaping the area. He noted the presence of Norton Critchlow from GSA and architect Suman Sorg from Sorg and Associates, and asked Ms. Sorg to make the presentation.

Ms. Sorg said there were essentially two elements to the design: the guard booth, which related to the museum design, and the paving, lighting, and railings, which related to the design of the Auditor's Building. She described the paved plaza, noting that the pavers would be keyed to the colors of the Auditor's Building--red, black, and beige--and would be used to create an all-over pattern throughout the plaza and to mark the angled parking spaces; this kind of parking would create pockets along the alleyway next to the museum in which trees would be planted, and it would provide additional garden space along the east wall of the West Annex, the site of the principal garden development; children in the Auditor's Building day-care center would use this area to reach their playground on Independence Avenue. She described the circulation for vehicular traffic going to the parking areas and also to the drop-off and pick-up point for the day-care center. She also described additional safety measures for pedestrians, including new railings and replacement of old ones in bad repair, as well as curbs, raised granite areas and granite bumper car-stops.

Ms. Sorg then described the guard booth. It would be a triangular structure of metal and glass panels, sympathetic in design to the Holocaust Museum, and would sit on a granite pavement, rather than the reddish brick pavers. It would be located at the 14th Street entrance into the parking area; retractable bollards across the driveway would provide further security.

The Chairman said he was very pleased with the design and asked for any other comments. Ms. Diamonstein asked Ms. Sorg if architect James Freed or the Holocaust Museum had been involved with the plans, and she was assured that they had

approved them. There were no other comments, and the site improvements were unanimously approved. Exhibit F

F. District of Columbia Department of Consumer Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O. G. 97-88. Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School, 1534 35th Street, N.W. New performing arts and physical education centers. Permit. (Previous: O.G. 96-95. Concept reviewed and approved by CFA 19 September 1996.) Mr. Carson informed the members that the Georgetown Board had recommended permit approval for this project. He pointed out the school and the site for the new construction on an aerial photograph and said only minor changes had been made since the Commission approved the concept design. He introduced architect David Cox to continue the presentation.

The Chairman commented that since the changes were only minor, and the Georgetown Board had approved them, it was probably not necessary for the Commission to hear an extensive explication, unless the other members wanted it. There were no requests, and the final design was then unanimously approved. Exhibit G

b. Appendix I. The Appendix was approved without objection, with Mrs. Rafshoon recusing herself from voting on O.G. 97-103, which involved her residence.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 97-52, Watergate Office Building, 600 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. Ventilation louvers for new cooling equipment at grade. Conceptual. Mr. Martínez recalled that as the members drove by the Watergate during their pre-meeting tour, he had pointed out an area on a low wall where the louvers for the cooling towers would be placed. The wall adjoined Park Service land, and as the existing landscaping would have to be removed and replaced, the building owners had agreed to assume the cost and do the work in consultation with the Park Service. He said there were also alternative studies, encouraged by the staff, for a rooftop location for the equipment. The architect, William Rueda, was then introduced to discuss the various alternatives.

Mr. Rueda said he had been asked to relocate two cooling towers currently in the Watergate garage because they were causing a humidity problem in the garage and also causing the windshields of entering air-conditioned cars to fog up. The first approach would involve placing a 5 by 36-foot louver in

a low wall facing Park Service land, and while Mr. Rueda did not think this would have much effect on Rock Creek Parkway, it would affect the pedestrians using the adjacent walkway. To mitigate this, a new planting scheme was proposed, one that would extend outward a bit more toward the walkway so that taller and more dense plantings could be used.

An alternative would be to place the equipment in a penthouse on the roof; it would be similar to one already existing. Mr. Rueda said it was a viable alternative except for the possibility of complaints and legal action from the residents of the Watergate apartments, and for this reason the owner was not in favor of it; it would also be more expensive. A third alternative would be to put in a grate at ground level. Finally, a louver could be installed on the other side of the wall, facing a plaza; this location was not pursued because of the presence of a restaurant facing onto the plaza.

Mr. Rueda then introduced Joe Cook from the Park Service. Mr. Cook said their problem with both the louver in the wall and the grate on the surface was that the plume of steam generated from the exhaust would create a nuisance for motorists on the parkway, and would probably kill the vegetation around it; the plume would be especially noticeable in winter. The grate at ground level would bring another problem--homeless people sleeping on it. Mr. Cook said that because of these drawbacks, the Park Service would prefer to see the cooling towers moved to the roof.

The Chairman and the other members all agreed that there was no objection to the rooftop location unless sight-line studies proved otherwise; nothing would be obscured from view except a small part of the sky, and it did not seem that the owner could incur any liability from that. When asked, Mr. Rueda said the housing would be 16-feet tall, 4 feet lower than the existing penthouse. No variances would be needed to build it. The Chairman and Mrs. Brody thought the Commission should side with the Park Service and the general public good and encourage the roof solution, rather than consider the pleasure of a few apartment owners; the other members agreed. Mr. Rueda asked if the Commission would take a look at placing a grate at ground level on the building property. Mr. Cook responded that it would still be on the drivers' side of the wall, and the plume factor would still exist.

The Chairman told Mr. Rueda that the Commission would consider any solution that he and the Park Service could jointly recommend. Otherwise, he said, the only option the Commission had seen that it could recommend was the roof solution. Exhibit G

The public meeting was adjourned at 2:12 p.m. and reconvened in executive session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

White House Comprehensive Plan

The entire transcript of this presentation and discussion is attached to these minutes as Exhibit H. As the presentation was for information only, no action was taken. The executive session was adjourned at 3:05 p.m., and the members left for an inspection of objects proposed for acquisition at the Freer Gallery.

III. INSPECTION

Freer Gallery of Art. The members inspected the objects proposed for acquisition and approved them. Exhibit I

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

30 June 1997

Dear Mr. Lew:

The Commission was pleased to see you and your consultants during its meeting 19 June 1997 to discuss the current design for the Convention Center. The revisions shown, especially with respect to the south entrance facade, appear to have answered certain of the concerns raised by the members at earlier presentations. In general, with a few caveats, the concept design is approved.

As the design is developed, further thought should be given to providing the remaining elevations with some of the dynamic articulation now apparent in the south elevation. This same dynamism could extend to other elements of the complex, including the "L" Street bridge which might assume the shape of an oval, echoing the curve of the entrance facade.

Closer attention should focus on finish materials, as well. We do not feel that using typical residential brick units and joints will have the desired result of reducing the apparent scale of the structure. Perhaps a Roman brick and "knife" joint could help, or some other material more in keeping with a building of that size.

The Commission looks forward to the review of this project as design development continues. As always, the staff is available should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Allen Y. Lew
Managing Director of Development
Washington Convention Center Authority
900 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT B

30 June 1997

Dear Mr. McDaniel:

The Commission was pleased to see you and your colleagues during its meeting of 19 June 1997 to discuss both the revised scheme for security elements along "E" Street south of the White House, as well as the draft Comprehensive Plan for the White House and its grounds.

Phase I of the revised scheme for "E" Street is approved in concept. The combination of metal bollards and twelve-inch high granite walls with low ground cover at both intersections of 17th Street is reasonable. The Commission looks forward to a final design review which should include the selection of a medium grey granite, details on the bollards, and the designs for the proposed planters, guard booths and entrance gates. Phase II, which includes narrowing "E" Street, requires further design consideration, especially in light of the concerns raised over proposed underground parking as described in the Comprehensive Plan.

With respect to the draft Comprehensive Plan, the first reaction of the Commission is to commend your exhaustive efforts. The second is to recommend further consideration of underground parking at the Ellipse, rather than overloading the delicate urban fabric of Pennsylvania Avenue as the document suggests.

The third reaction is a concern that too many important meeting spaces would be tucked underground when it seems that there are alternatives worth exploring. Looking into a more efficient use of space at the OEOB as well as minor additions to the White House office wings were several suggestions offered.

The Commission looks forward to an update on the Plan. Meanwhile, the staff is available should any questions develop with respect to the security elements proposed for "E" Street.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James I. McDaniel
Director, White House Liaison Office
National Park Service
National Capital Region
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

30 June 1997

Dear Ms. Mavritte:

During its meeting 19 June 1997, the Commission reviewed and approved the concept designs for the three proposed chanceries at the International Center: Ethiopia on lot 5, Brunei on lot 18 and the United Arab Emirates on lot 19.

The architecture and landscaping proposed for each new structure appears imaginative as well as sensitive to the culture of its client.

The Commission looks forward to the review of the designs as they develop and the submission of material samples when selected.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Donna Mavritte
Project Manager
International Center
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

30 June 1997

EXHIBIT D

Dear Mr. Granahan:

During its meeting of 19 June 1997, the Commission reviewed two proposals for the U.S. Court of Military Appeals at 450 "E" Street on Judiciary Square. The members have approved the landscape renovation immediately adjacent to the building as well as the removal of the neighboring split rail fencing which was an incongruous addition to the historic grounds. The Commission looks forward to the review of the bollard and chain replacement when convenient.

With reluctance, the Commission also approved the addition of security cameras at the top of the building, mounted to the roof. It is understood that this is an interim measure pending eventual improvements to surveillance technology that will allow for a more discreet installation in the future. It is further understood that the equipment, painted grey, will not be attached to the existing masonry.

Should you have any questions, the staff is available to provide assistance.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Thomas F. Granahan
Clerk of the Court
U.S. Court of Military Appeals
450 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20442-0001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

30 June 1997

Dear Mr. Diehl:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed designs for the Robert F. Kennedy commemorative silver dollar with representatives from the Mint at its 19 June meeting.

For the obverse, the portrait by sculptor/engraver Thomas Rogers of the Mint was approved in concept; it does, however, need further study to bring it closer to the one on which it was based, the C. J. Fox portrait. Since a drawing is a poor way by which to judge a sculptural portrait, the Commission requests that it see a plaster model at its next meeting on 24 July.

Of the two reverse designs presented, the Commission approved the one by Jim Peed depicting the seals of the Senate and the Department of Justice. The other design, with a long quotation, a second portrait and two other elements, was considered too complicated when reduced to coin size.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable Philip N. Diehl, Director
United States Mint
633 Third Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

THE PENSION BUILDING
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

30 June 1997

Dear Mr. Crichlow:

The Commission reviewed and approved the proposed guardhouse and site improvements for the Auditor's Building at its meeting 19 June 1997.

The guardhouse is an imaginative complement to the Holocaust Memorial Museum. The proposed parking scheme, with its paving and landscaping, is a big improvement over existing conditions. In this vein, the proposed trees between the parking area and the Holocaust Memorial Museum are essential to the project. They will soften the hard edge that currently separates the two buildings.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Norton B. Crichlow
Project Officer
Property Development Division
General Services Administration
National Capital Region
Washington, D.C. 20407

EXHIBIT G

19 June 1997

AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 97-98 HPA. 97-235	1524 35th Street, N.W. Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School	New performing arts and physical education centers - permit

ACTION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed new physical education center and addition and modification to existing gymnasium for new performing arts center at the Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Action (O.G. 96-95). No objection to new landscaping, retaining walls and walks in coordination with new "campus" quadrangle and new parking lots. Erect material sample panel in a location facing south for approval by the Commission before contracting for materials.

S.L. 97-52	600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W. John Hancock Mutual Life Watergate Office Building	Louvers for relocated cooling towers - conceptual

ACTION: Recommend **AGAINST** concept for proposed thru-the-wall louvers for exhaust of relocated cooling towers. Proposed installation of louvers is inappropriate for a wall adjacent to public space and park land. Recommend study of alternative location of cooling towers on roof.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

COMMISSION MEETING

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Washington, D.C.

* * *

The meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was convened at 2:12 p.m. Thursday, June 19, 1997 at the Pension Building, 441 F Street, N.W., Suite 312, Washington, D.C. 20001, J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman presiding.

In Attendance:

Members of the Commission of Fine Arts:

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

BARBARALEE DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL

CAROLYN BRODY

ANN TODD FREE

EDEN RAFSHOON

Staff:

Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Sue Kohler, Historian
Jeffrey Carson, Architect
Jose Martinez-Canino

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN BROWN: We now have the White House and the National Park Service to explain their comprehensive plan. Mr. McDaniels?

MR. McDANIELS: I remember I guess about 16 years ago, in 1981, this Commission, when you were located at Jackson Place, was talking with us about East Executive Avenue, the street between the White House and the Treasury Building. At that time the National Park Service was very concerned with safety, pedestrian safety, with all the cars, the noise that it generated and the generally unpleasant and unsafe experience for people approaching the White House from the east side.

At that time the Commission urged that we look long-term about those problems and others in the White House area and undertake a master plan effort, some kind of a comprehensive study of all the problems that were occurring at that time. We listened to that and started the process of scoping out a long-term plan.

A couple of years later, in 1983, after the Marine barracks was bombed in Lebanon, we were back before you talking about security improvements in the White House area and again heard that same recommendation, that it's time to step back and take a look at everything that's happening in that area and look with vision 20 years or so down the road and see what could be done to develop a comprehensive plan that all the agencies would buy into for the White House and the President's Park.

It took some time to gain the support for that, to get all the agencies together, to get the funding from Congress, but a little over four years ago we had everything lined up and started the process of developing a comprehensive design plan from the White House and surrounding the President's Park.

In the interim, over the last four years, we have come back on occasion to the Commission to bring you up to date on the progress of the plan. And at this point we have to present to you an informational briefing on where we stand right now.

At this point all of the 13 agencies who have been working together on this plan have agreed on a draft plan.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Can you imagine that ever

happening in Washington?

MR. McDANIELS: It really, I think, gives us a lot of satisfaction that we are at this point. We have an environmental impact statement that is traveling along with the plan and we'd like to lay out for you the elements, the major elements of the plan. This is to keep you up to date with the latest and to listen to what you might have to say, the questions you might have on the plan as it is right now.

Interestingly, when we actually started the work, we looked around the National Park Service for someone who had a lot of experience in planning and brought a person on to act as the coordinator of the plan. That person is Ann Bowman Smith, who, starting with the Yosemite master plan in the 1960s and several other plans, has had several jobs within the National Park Service, including Ann was the one who started our Volunteer in the Parks program several years ago.

Ann came on as the project coordinator four years ago and just within the last month I've been fortunate to have her actually come on my staff as assistant director for project development. So Ann is positioned now to finish the planning project with us and actually take responsibility for the implementation as we eventually move to approved plan and to design and construction.

So, with that, Ann, would you like to bring us up to date?

MS. SMITH: Part of the liability of having some experience is that it discloses more sometimes than one would wish when one cites the years of one's involvement.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I'd like to take just a few moments to hit the highlights of the plan. I know on the walk-through you saw a number of the areas and I'll show you briefly where we were on that walk-through and then open it up for your questions. I know you've had some time to consider the document and the elements.

If I might touch on some of the highlights of the planning or the major elements, when we began the planning effort, we knew we were dealing with a powerful symbol of our nation. We knew we were dealing with historic landscapes and historic

vistas to the north and to the south. And for that reason, we also knew that we would be either using existing structures or going below grade, in most cases.

We were faced with a site that has been highly reactive over the years, that had had its last major work done on the grounds in the 1930s, had the last major work done in terms of facilities in the 1950s and, as you saw on the walk-through, is a surprise behind the scenes in terms of the kinds of structure and kinds of infrastructure that's available to the site.

In looking at the site, at the various areas of the planning, let me begin with the home of the President and the first family, since that is the primary function of this particular site. There are two major elements in the plan that address the home. One is storage. Things are tucked in every corner, against every wall, and many things stored off-site and repeatedly brought back, which is additional staffing, additional clearance time every time something is brought back to the site.

For that reason you will see a proposal in the plan to have a storage area below grade underneath Pennsylvania Avenue, with a direct connection to the residence for storage.

The second area was one that was pointed out by people who have served a long time and a number of first families. It's a problem faced by many universities in their homes for their presidents, as well. That is that this is a very formal home. It does not have the kind of indoor informal recreation space that families either have available in their own homes or close by. Nor does the first family move with great ease any longer, given the attendant security that's necessary.

So you will see in the plan, as well, a proposal to have first family recreation space, secure, indoor, informal space somewhere to the north of the house. Its exact location has not been determined. It's been discussed as being below grade or it might use some other kind of facility on the site but would be an indoor location.

In terms of the office of the Presidnet, and this is an area that was of interest to those of us on the planning team, we've had political

adversaries in the same room. It's been a very bipartisan effort. We've had them sit at the same table and describe exactly the same problems and the same desperate needs.

So there is an agreement on the part of the people who have served here in previous administrations and the present administration as to what kinds of problems exist.

One of the major ones is meeting space. The Architect of the Capitol took steps a number of years ago to add more modern meeting space there on the west face, below the terrace. There is not modern meeting space here. The rooms are very formal. They have very bad acoustics. If you've been in any of the ones in the Old Executive Office Building, they do not have state-of-the-art materials or facilities available to them.

So you will see a proposed facility below grade underneath West Executive Avenue for up-to-date modern meeting space.

You will also see a proposal for the news media, for an expanded work area and expanded briefing room. The present colonnade, west colonnade area, which is used by the media, which is this tiny dot in here, is very cramped. The picture you see on television with the seal looks very nice but if you were to turn that camera around, it's a very small space. It's got reels and cables and ladders and equipment crammed into a very small work area. It is very difficult for the press. It is very difficult for the staff.

We did form a working group with the White House Correspondents Association, the White House News Photographers Association, the network pool, the White House Press Office, to work on what the future needs were and the proposal that you see in the plan is reflective of that, with one alteration.

The colonnade is one full level and then half of a second level and that lower level space is a very difficult space. Adjacent to it is the old swimming pool that was built for FDR. The second half of that space is very difficult. It's very cramped. It's very awkward to get down to. And in the working sessions, the media also agreed that was a difficult space but I'm not sure they'd favor, the way we do, the fact that that ought to stop being a work area. It's a very awkward space.

The proposal in the plan is that that would be used for storage at the site but they would retain the first level of the colonnade, and the access issue is a major one, as you might expect, for the press corps. The accessibility to the White House press secretary is their criteria. Easy access is their criteria for a successful location and ease of movement to and from that.

But we would also propose below grade expansion that would have a new briefing room, presidential briefing room, state of the art also. It would have room for out-of-town and foreign press. Strangely enough now, the out-of-town foreign press simply overrun the area and have no place to land at all. The Architect of the Capitol again, the Senate and the House, have provided those kinds of space, the Pentagon has adequate space, and we find the executive branch with a very cramped and unusual situation.

Also in the area of the executive office, in terms of support of the whole site, the utilities at the site are in need of renovation throughout the entire area.

The parking for staff, and senior staff being differentiated from the larger regular staff -- let me deal first with senior staff and the motorcade staging, which is a significant number of automobiles, and also diplomatic arrivals with motorcades.

The proposal is below grade facility under Pennsylvania Avenue that would be accessed in two ways, two portals. We were desperate to find ways to not have those be visible and we are proposing tucking one in here on West Executive Avenue.

You will remember when we came into the site, we came in East Executive Avenue and we entered here at the East Appointment Gate. We came across, went through this -- not this actual line because this is proposed below grade -- we walked in the service drive. We walked underneath the north portico, and that's where -- we were in that corridor area below ground and came up the other side.

Here's where we came along the media space and we walked through here. This is where the stand-up areas were for the media cameras. Then we walked down along West Executive Avenue and crossed and turned and looked up in this direction. It's

that location that we would tuck in a single lane portal. It works against the grade so it's very short and it drops in quickly.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Excuse me. Just repeat that last thing. It is there that you would drop in what?

MS. SMITH: A portal, a one-lane, single access portal to --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Vehicular access.

MS. SMITH: Vehicular access to an underground parking facility.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: And now there is one lane that formerly came from Pennsylvania Avenue to the mansion?

MS. SMITH: Actually, it's wider than -- West Executive Avenue now has cars parked on both sides, plus it has about a lane and a half in the middle. You can't pass but it's about equal to a lane and a half.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: And you now want to do an underground portal there?

MS. SMITH: A portal here that would drop into a below grade facility, which is pictured over here. But the key point for West Executive Avenue that I should mention first because otherwise that suggestion won't make sense is that West Executive Avenue, the cars would be removed from there, from both sides. It would no longer be a parking area, which --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: So all this parking in this whole quadrant, so to speak, surface parking would all disappear?

MS. SMITH: Yes. One of the --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: The Treasury direction, as well?

MS. SMITH: Let me clarify on Treasury. The planning effort, as a guiding principle at the beginning, sought to remove the standing and parked automobiles from the whole site. There is no parking below grade, with the exception of a tiny area over here and the Treasury moat, where they have part of their motor pool and they have their trash compactor.

The Secretary of Treasury's spot would not be changed. That's located here off East Executive Avenue. Nothing would change there. But the staff parking is located here. Senior staff is located here on West Executive Avenue, with staff parking

all throughout this area. Treasury does have some parking over here.

All that would be proposed for removal and relocation and it's being relocated in a number of places, the first of which is the senior staff parking here is being relocated -- proposed to be relocated in an underground facility under Pennsylvania Avenue. It would accessed through this portal that I mentioned here off West Executive Avenue. It would also be accessed by the existing entry to New Executive Office Building, which is here on H Street. There's an existing entry to the parking lot there and the vehicular corridor connection that would come down and pedestrian connection that would come to this, as well. So there would be two points of entry: one tucked into the top of West Executive Avenue, which is then relandscaped to have the park-like qualities that are on the other side --

MS. RAFSHOON: The access in front of the White House at 17th Street, the grade would drop to go under, so in front of Blair House there would be a dip going to the underground parking?

MS. SMITH: There would be no change in the surface level in the plan. This is all below ground level.

MS. RAFSHOON: But for the entry.

MS. SMITH: No, the entry -- let me think of the easiest way to put this. Nothing changes here on the surface. This is all below grade. Once you drop in to the New Executive Office Building ramp, you are below ground the entire distance.

MS. RAFSHOON: I misunderstood. I thought you said there was also an entry --

MS. SMITH: There is an entry here off of H. Then it would be connected with the vehicular underground corridor that would connect to this parking facility.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: How long would it take to create all this underground excavation and new facility?

MS. SMITH: I'm not sure we have an estimate on the length of time on that.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Is there any ballpark figure?

MS. SMITH: There is on the back of the EIS Construction but I don't think -- as I recall,

this is in phase one, so it's in the first five years. But I can't imagine that it would be a total of five. I think you're looking at several years.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: And what happens to the day-to-dayness, the quotidian nature of this so heavily used facility while this very massive and invasive construction takes place?

MS. SMITH: Good question. One of the things that characterizes construction at the White House is, and I had someone from GSA who'd been there for many years tell me he always added a third of the time and a third of the money, for the very reason you just mentioned.

This site has to continue to function constantly, so one has to be extremely flexible in the construction and the timing of the construction. It has become a fine art at the White House as to when one does construction and how one works around the on-going things that have to occur there. It does lengthen the construction period.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: You could envision this taking, for example, a four-year period. What do you do with an inaugural parade during this -- I'm just asking --

MS. SMITH: We had the same question and we've tried very hard. You'll note here a reference to the fact that it has to be completed. In other words, it has to be set up so that it can be completed between inaugurations, and there are a number of ways that might be done, but no one that I know would want to be standing in the way of an inaugural parade with construction of this sort.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: All the good intentions in the world, in terms of construction, often do not dictate --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Yes; it's a nice motivation, however.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: On just a practical level, is the state of the art in telecommunications, that really does change now, and the delivery of transmission of messages, signals, electronically and otherwise, changes so rapidly; how is that dealt with?

I was thinking that this is sort of like drawing a new hospital that, by the time the facility is completed on the drawing board, it is

obsolete in terms of the rapid --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: It's very similar.

MS. SMITH: We're concerned about that so we did take a step with the news media working group. They were enormously helpful. Several of the network representatives invited in a fellow who works for actually Bell Atlantic in their futures program and we spent an afternoon with him, both in terms of what's happening within the news media, which they spent a great deal of time explaining to us, and also for him to talk to both of us, because some of us there were not aware of it, of what was coming.

But there are some things that do not change and one of the things -- because we argued -- we, the planning team, argued that wasn't there a technology change coming that would mean that people didn't physically have to be there in the same numbers?

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: That was really -- I was thinking of the way now one sends the entire script in and it only shows up in the studio for the recitation.

MS. SMITH: That was our conviction, was that we were headed in that direction. There is an equal and I might say overwhelming conviction on the part of the news media that that is not the case.

There are some technology changes occurring and one of them that has shifted in the other way is news photographers who used to hand off their roll of film to the runner are now digitizing and they need a location to sit down and download. So we have the reverse occurring, with a group that didn't need work space is now telling us we not only need work space; we need storage space of a different nature than we had before and we need plugs. So it works both ways.

We did unwind this rather carefully with that working group. They were enormously helpful. They also have a very strong point of view as to --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And a good soapbox to pronounce it from.

MS. SMITH: So we have tried to do it in such a way that -- I mentioned flexibility in construction. Flexibility is the key word at this site for everyone. You have to be able to adjust within an administration, within the technology,

within the society, so everything you do has to have the ability to move or shrink and slightly grow and change its configuration.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Proceed.

MS. SMITH: On the senior level parking and the staging of motorcades, right now if you watch the area, motorcades are staged throughout the area. It is a very difficult situation. Those would now, in the plan, be proposed to take place below grade in that parking facility.

In addition to this facility, the larger number of staff, and there are 850 parking spaces that are permit spaces that are out here and here, would be handled in a number of possible ways. One of them is to expand, and you'll note in the plan there are two possible options. One is to expand this with a separate access through the existing building portal here, the Office of Thrift Supervision. The other is to expand the Office of Thrift Supervision's parking below grade and add 200 spaces.

You can do 200 here or 200 here. You cannot do both. Our transportation consultant tells us that this street grid over here is in trouble. It can take 200 more but it cannot take 400 more cars.

So you choose, in our transportation consultant's words, you choose here or here to add 200, but you cannot do 400. That's one possibility.

The other possibility that you'll see mentioned in the plan is to acquire a structure for parking off-site on this side of the site or to lease parking in a variety of locations, not necessarily in one parking facility but spread throughout this general area, and have the staff relocate to those leased spaces off-site.

In terms of visitor use, the experience at the White House until very recently, until the last several years, was simply to gather on the Eclipse, get your brochure and go through. You went through with a guided congressional tour or a regular public tour.

Several years ago the Park Service opened the White House Visitors Center here at the north end of the Commerce Building. The proposed plan would expand this facility. There are two vacant floors below the existing Baldridge Hall. You'd go

down those two vacant floors and then move to the west with a series of four small theaters. The reason for the four small theaters is there are 5,000 people a day who go through in a two, two-and-a-half-hour period of time, and the line has to pulse out in groups of 250. So the four small theaters are used to pulse those groups out into the tour process.

There are difficulties now in crossing E Street. It is very labor-intensive, with rangers stopping traffic in both the service lane, access lane, and the public lanes for groups of 250 at a time to cross.

So you will see in the proposal a corridor from the lower levels of the visitors center. In other words, you'd come into Baldridge Hall, go through the visitors center experience to the theaters and then proceed via tunnel, and the circles you see on the map are intended to be skylights. We're thinking of a wide, naturally lit lively pedestrian corridor.

People would move through on people-movers and they would thus cross the 15th Street traffic and cross the E Street traffic because they would come to grade here in what's called Lily Triangle, so-called for the day lilies that are presently planted there. And they would come to grade here in a structure that is at the base of a slight berm. If you look at the area now you'll see this is heavy vegetation in here, heavily screened, and the intent is, at the conceptual level we're at here, is to do a slight berm, come to grade with an escalator and with an elevator for handicapped access.

This would put the tour line on the fence line up to the visitor entrance building where they now enter the site. This was the subject of much debate within the executive committee of the agencies that helped to guide this process. Very strong feeling that the experience should not be a direct underground connection, which is what we had discussed, because we were trying to save people from the elements -- the heat and the cold, that it should not occur that way, that the surface experience was very important, that getting the setting of the White House, getting that orientation of where you are and seeing the glimpses through the fence, seeing the relationship

to the Capitol here at the other end and to the Treasury building was terribly important to people.

And so you see the mix of perspectives here from getting people safely through two streams of traffic and comfortably and quickly to this location, and then also allowing them to have the surface experience and then enter the house in the regular tour group.

In terms of transportation, going back even before the alternatives, and for those of you who are new on the Commission, I did bring the previous materials so you can see the alternative space that we came through, but even at that point we were discussing, as a given for all alternatives, that Jackson Place and Madison Place would become pedestrian ways and automobiles would be removed from there and people would be able to move freely as pedestrians throughout this area.

Pennsylvania Avenue, the closure of the avenue by the Treasury Department in May of 1995 changed our planning in the sense that that separate but very coordinated planning effort was instituted. There are a number of us who serve on both planning teams but it is separate, given the assignment, the direct assignment we were given and the speed with which we were asked to move.

So you will find that when you look at those materials, we've tried to be sure, very sure, that they are married in terms of concept and in terms of design.

The outcome of the Pennsylvania Avenue process, which, at the moment, is on hold pending completion of environmental compliance by the Treasury Department, their action to close, they did not finish their compliance yet. When they finish that, we then can go back to National Capital Planning Commission and finish our design process. At the moment, we're on hold.

When that is complete and the final design is approved for Pennsylvania Avenue, we would see that folding back into the comprehensive design plan. But at this particular moment in time that we're looking at it, they are on two parallel but very coordinated tracks. They do have their own separate compliance documents traveling with them, as well.

On E Street or on the southern part of the site, Hamilton Place has basically already become a

pedestrian area or only authorized vehicles. State Place in the same action that restricted traffic up here on Pennsylvania Avenue, also restricted State Place and left E Street in two lanes going eastbound and left the access lane on the north side, going into the complex.

And looking at E Street, again we had quite intense discussions and process about what should happen on E Street. The original thinking for the planning effort was to try and unify the site, that it has been cut up and crossed by walls of metal, be they moving or parked, and to try and unify those. And with that as a starting point and the historic landscape involved here, the park unity, the vistas, visitor safety in terms of crossing here, the visitor experience of coming through automobiles, has brought us to the point where you'll see in the plan and the proposal that two public lanes eastbound are to be retained and the access lanes, secure access lanes, to be retained on the north side.

That proposal, we believe, serves the variety of interests that we were asked to look at. There are those around town, and let's be very candid about it, there are those around town who believe that somehow what happened here, in terms of traffic congestion, which people feel is rather intense in some places; their perception is that that can solve that, and our work does not bear that out.

I'll give you a for-instance. There is a discussion now about whether or not to put two lanes eastbound and two lanes westbound. And certainly you would improve something, but you also do not make a major change in the level of service, which is failing up here. You do not make it okay.

Well, the question is where the trade-offs are, in terms of both immediate and long-term, for the transportation system as well as the historic landscape.

There also is a difficulty over here on 17th Street. The intersection of 17th, State and New York is failing, badly. And if you come westbound with two lanes of traffic, and one of the proposals would turn right here, up 17th and then left; the other one would widen this. This is an historic district. The other proposal would take 12 feet of this historic district, widen these

three lanes to four, and bring them to 18th to turn right and then left. But in this proposal, you're going into an already failing intersection with additional traffic.

So the E Street discussion is an enormously complex one. It is our job, in terms of looking long-term at this site, to be weighing elements in addition to traffic flow, and that is the part that has been challenging for the planning effort.

The character of this site is of concern because if you noticed when we were over there, there's a little bit of everything. If you go back over on East Executive Avenue, you'll even find blue plastic bubblers providing water on a temporary basis during the summer. And there's a great deal of concern about the character of the area.

There are design guidelines that the executive committee had worked with others to put together that will guide future elements of this site. There is also the feeling that it is time for a freshening perhaps of the Olmsted plan but more so a landscape plan for outside the fence, the areas that have not been looked at before in terms of landscape planning. Olmsted certainly did a job that I don't believe anyone can challenge inside the fence, but outside the fence there's a need to take a look at landscape planning.

There's also a need for a lighting plan. This site has very mixed and irregular lighting, a very difficult situation. So that is another area that we're calling for work to be done.

I think that, in addition to the site circulation corridor, really covers most of the high points of the proposals. The corridors that you see, the ones in the purple here are pedestrian in nature. The ones here are vehicle and pedestrian, the darker blue. And this cross-corridor is below the grade we walk on. We walked through those service drives and then through, underneath the portal.

This would be at a level below that, which would allow materials and staff to circulate freely, not going through that small space that we saw and not going through and interfering in any way through the tour operation on the ground floor of the house.

So that site circulation would enable goods and materials to move unseen, for the most part, instead of as they do now, which is coming in through every possible entrance and exit.

It's very similar to the Architect of the Capitol, the problems that they've faced up there. They finished a master plan in 1981. They have many of the same problems. They have no back door. They have approached their solutions, in fact, in many of the same ways that we have, in terms of going below grade with below-grade connections.

I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have. I know it's quite a daunting document to get through, so I'd be happy to clarify anything that you have questions on.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Well, we really commend you for the amount of study and work. It's just an immense thing to work with all these various agencies that have their own turf and axes to grind and so forth. The planning process is so important so that people can be thinking long-term about what one should do. It's certainly substandard in the existing condition. I don't think anybody who goes there --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Embarrassingly so.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Mrs. Diamonstein-Spielvogel used to work in the EOB and remembers those days. Any of us who have to go in and out of there, it's just so demeaning that our most important office should be approached through such a substandard alleyway. So the de-alleyfication of the White House is important.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: And if you think of the communications area and the numbers of substantial distinguished -- celebrated and sometimes even distinguished persons who are interviewed in this jerry-built facility that keeps on being upgraded over and over again, it is embarrassing to know the state of some of those things.

What is it that we are meant to be doing at this point? Because, on the one hand, you're quite right, at least by my lights, it is daunting to know how comprehensive you must be in order to come up with a master plan. On the other hand, I do have always, with master plans, nagging concerns about obsolescence during the planning period and

also how disruptive to the business of government and the chief executive and his or her family this might be. Did you note that optimistic little note?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: But I think that neither of those should be used as excuses for just going along with --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: No, I'm just mentioning all the components that compound how difficult it is even to comment on your enormous effort. Where you have fingertip knowledge of every aspect of it -- how many people should pulse out at any given moment, all of the aspects, it's almost presumptuous, in a way, to comment.

MS. SMITH: What would be helpful, though, is that level of detail is not necessarily any measure of successful conclusion of something in Washington or in the nation. It would be helpful for us to hear your reactions to the overall plan or the elements of it because you also bring perspectives from other arenas as to how people might view this or about bells that went off for you as I was talking that you think might be problem areas.

MS. BRODY: I have a couple of thoughts. My first reaction, and I had trouble going through this and actually I found your presentation so clear and so thoughtful and sort of compelling at the same time that I'm intrigued to go back through this at some point in time.

I think it is even this afternoon sort of difficult to absorb everything, but I will tell you that my quick reaction is that I am very impressed by the process and the consensus and that you've really protected and enhanced and defended a lot of the experiential things that are important and that we all associate with the majesty of this area and yet you've been functional and sort of fundamental in your approach, and I think that that's to be commended.

I frankly feel in good hands, that you've gotten this far, you've achieved consensus and gone forward. I assume we'll keep doing this from time to time and get updates as things become more specific, but right now I think you have protected, for my mind, the important things and yet tried to understand parking and transportation and communications.

I do echo -- I understand exactly what you're saying about it's daunting and what about obsolescence? On the other hand, Carter is right that you have to start someplace and they are so far behind at this point.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Yes. But I concur with everything you've said but I find interior resistance to one aspect of it, in spite of the fact that I know how profoundly you've researched it, and that is how much is underground in a very contained area, including all of this parking, all of this excavation, and how much that indoor recreation facility and that indoor meeting room that is subgrade, how uninviting spaces that have no natural light are.

MS. SMITH: Your point is well taken. We looked several times at the quadrangle at the Smithsonian, where they have, you know, used skylights. They have used a wonderful mix of artificial and natural light to change how you feel, even at that lowest level.

And the thinking, while we're at the conceptual level, the thinking is this has to happen here, too, that you can't put people underground and have them lose that total sense of connection with what's happening outside. I did it once in an office and it's extremely disorienting.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: And more importantly, it is displeasing. And here you've figured out that it is so important to surface and require the processional approach to appreciate the entire experience, and I think that's so fundamental, that early decision that you've made there.

MS. SMITH: Where we have tried to go below grade more, and there's no question you're right, is in the functional areas. In other words, staff, in moving from point A to point B, is usually --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: But I think that is a great improvement. The nagging concerns remain with the underground meeting room because if the Indian Treaty Room does not have state-of-the-art facilities, it has an environment that won't be duplicated or replicated anyplace else and it might be a better idea to bring that up to grade technologically than finding a subterranean space that, at best, can be arid.

MS. BRODY: I think it is very important to be -- obviously in regard to the parking you said you were exploring off-site parking, leasing, building a new structure. I think it is very important to be aggressive in looking at things like that that are off-site, things that don't need to be attached or directly connected.

And I would say the same with some of the meeting spaces. Whether they can be off-site, I know there are enormous problems with that and lots of people can't go off-site, but to the extent some things could possibly, I'd be aggressive on that.

I would also think about doing some rehab and some upgrading and I don't know the politics of this within OEOB or some other spaces --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Some of the most wonderful rooms in Washington for public gatherings.

MS. BRODY: If you upgrade aggressively some of those other spaces before you tunnel under --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Exactly.

MS. SMITH: GSA does have things on the books where they're looking at redoing OEOB. Even they, though, have said to us that their planning, their long-range planning for this building, has looked at doing additional meeting space. Again, they were going to go below grade here underneath the north port.

I hear you and we will look at that.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Following that reasoning, how about the peripheral streets where there are office buildings and other facilities that might be underutilized or inappropriately utilized that might tangentially be less expensive, less invasive, more productive to attach oneself to?

MS. SMITH: In response, I want to give you some pieces of that, not by way of arguing in any way but to give you the pieces so that you perhaps have a stronger argument.

In looking at that, there is a White House Conference Center built by this administration up here on Jackson Place. Even with that in place, because we asked is that being used -- absolutely. The occupancy figures show it slightly lower because they're counting weekends. They count 365 days a year. But they're in operation. They're

booked all the time.

The administration and previous administration representatives are saying there is not enough office space on site, as opposed to going off. In other words, the times when they go off and the movement of people off, it just is so consuming that the need is for right in close meeting space. Sometimes people -- meetings of 20 are being held, stand-up meetings are being held in offices in the Old Executive Office Building, let alone when people from off-site are coming.

In other words, the Presidnet and first family bringing people to the site, rather than moving so much off-site, and the spaces -- the only ones available are in the White House offices and those spaces are not set up to be those kinds of meeting rooms. There are different kinds of impacts there, as well.

The issue on going below grade or being within the site, part of what we've discussed is that they can't be arid, they can't feel like you're underground. They have to be done in such a way, either through the addition of natural light and the design that's used below grade has to feel right for the White House or it shouldn't be done. It simply can't be something that doesn't fit in this setting. I don't know if those would help you any.

There is also a concern I should mention that's political in nature. That is there is a concern that any move off-site has to be a careful move because it is so often interpreted as an expansion of the Executive Branch. This site goes political so quickly, can go hot so quickly into the partisan political area, that --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: A question of downsizing versus expanding.

MS. SMITH: Exactly, and that's been part of it, in addition to that need to have it more accessible in that close-in location. Those are pieces that --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: You have a great challenge but you seem up to it.

MS. SMITH: I must say that the executive committee is really a remarkable group because they have exercised enormous leadership in this planning effort in terms of guiding the team.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: But it still

does not address the whole Pennsylvania Avenue --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: No, it's excluded from this report.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: It would be so helpful to see that as part of a total scheme. It just seems to me that it can't be done in isolation, or else it'll be a two-stepper.

MS. SMITH: Right. We did not do them in isolation. They are standing as separate efforts because of the time and urgency of the Pennsylvania Avenue one starting, but they've been done very, very closely coordinated. And at the point at which Pennsylvania Avenue is completed, it will fold back into this.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: What's the timetable for this effort?

MS. SMITH: This effort is going to now, unless the review is finished, and we have some additional areas we've been asked to look at by the executive committee; when that work is completed, we would then go public with this document. I can't give you an exact time estimate on that at this point but we were looking toward the fall of this year.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: What are some of the additional areas that you've been asked to look at?

MS. SMITH: We've been asked to look at the parking issue, the staff parking issue, and, in particular, the trade-offs between going below grade on-site and going off-site.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: The very things that we brought up here.

MS. SMITH: Yes. In addition, in looking at the way various things are configured, in terms of spaces that might be available for different uses and be a little more flexible in those uses. But those elements -- we don't know yet --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: You mean like West Wing spaces that might be reconfigured?

MR. McDANIELS: Let's go very directly on this. We're in executive session and I think we owe it to you to answer your question directly.

Parking underground under the Eclipse is one of the alternatives but it's not on the proposed plan. The executive committee on Monday asked us to take another look at the feasibility. What can be done underground under the Eclipse in

terms of --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Would it be less disruptive to go from that direction?

MR. McDANIELS: Right.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: I mean, when you look at that, it's one of the things that springs to mind immediately --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Look at the Boston Common. Look at what the French do at the Place Vendome. It's expensive because of the water table and sewer line and other problems but from a Fine Arts Commission point of view, to get all that heavy metal, parking, off the President's front lawn and get it underground, it's a high priority. We realize that other people have other higher priorities which have to do with awful things like money, but if we could wave a wand, we would just clear out all of those cars tomorrow. Then we would have a great setting for our greatest house.

And if that is the ultimate goal, then perhaps we should at least take a look. It is in this plan as one of the alternatives, but perhaps move it up, because that's the point of master plans, is to give you something to aspire to.

All right, if you have to drop back for practical reasons as an alternative and give up some of your desiderata, but if you're defining desiderata, let's get those cars out of sight and have enough acreage there that could be given over to parking and also, from a political point of view, if some of it could be public parking and some of it be staff parking, and you may have to have a firewall between the two for security reasons --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: And then, for security, you couldn't have public parking there.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: If it's a separate parking garage.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Is there anything else, now that we're in executive session, that you'd like to tell us about?

MR. McDANIELS: And very much on track with where you were heading is that the executive committee expressed the same concern about particularly first family recreation space underground. So they've asked us to take another look at the colonnade area where the press is right now and is there a way to accommodate the press

access issue and yet restore the colonnade, the Roosevelt swimming pool for first family use?

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: If you look, too, at that footprint and I was thinking, how did it ever evolve into the lack of symmetry that the building -- you know, the West Wing and the East Wing there and how it evolved in that setback area, particularly since the connection to the EOB was of such significance.

So maybe the whole footprint, while you're looking at it, should be more symmetrical, if we're doing your desiderata, on the left-hand side, where you could do more than one thing. Is that possible?

MS. SMITH: I want to be sure I understand what you're talking about. Are you talking about the emphasis on --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: No, I'm talking about this executive committee asking you to review some concerns that have been expressed here, as well. But all the while I was looking at this, on both plans, especially so graphically on the left, how there seems to be -- how that evolved to that footprint.

MS. SMITH: The wings?

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Yes, the wings. I wondered how invasive it would be to move forward the west wing there --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: You mean to just build more structure?

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: A tiny bit.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Or would you cut out the west to make it symmetrical? Chop off the Oval Office?

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Thanks a lot.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: I see what you mean. From a helicopter point of view, extend the wall out to the east.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Exactly. Should it be extended a bit to the east and to the north, while you're doing it? And I don't mean to sound heretical but when I was standing in that East Room yesterday with a distinguished artist, I was pointing out to him the lack of distinction of the architecture in that room. I mean, if you look at the elements, and we found things that if you're waiting long enough, you find things in the dentals, in the pediments, in the crown moldings

that you've never seen before. I didn't realize that the two overdoors were a Buffalo head nickel. I didn't realize that. Had you ever seen that?

There were so many elements that seemed disparate, versus cohesive. And you realize, too, how incremental this structure has been.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Talk about symmetry. You ought to try to, just before World War II --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Or how about the 1950s? While we were building out this way --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Jim, show where it was in 1939.

MR. McDANIELS: This was built in 1941.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: And where you are is the 1950s coming forward this way, that Truman balcony.

MR. McDANIELS: This is 1909.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Yes, but the Truman balcony projection.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Well, for the projection they just add the balcony inside the columns.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Yes.

MR. McDANIELS: It's been very incremental and the solutions to problems have been incremental.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: When you're doing a master plan, I am submitting that once you have gone this far, you might like to be further emboldened and think of the two wings, as well. I mean, if you're doing it, you might as well do it.

MS. BRODY: Double the size?

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Well, it is, you know, an inadequate facility for a residence and office building, a visitors center, a tourist attraction.

MR. McDANIELS: It does deserve --

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: It's like a million and a half people that come through there in the daytime. Now it's about a million and a half in the nighttime, too.

MR. McDANIELS: One of the things that we've been trying to do, working with Secret Service on security improvements, is always this tension between the aesthetic and the security. So we've been trying to hold the line that security improvements will take no more of the existing footprint on the historic landscape.

So, in the future, any new improvements

that require more square footage of landscape will have to be offset by something being removed.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: But sort of like Central Park and the Metropolitan Museum, you need what appears to be, at least for the foreseeable century, a finite master plan that if you're going to make changes, it has to be within that volume someplace, somewhere.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: That's what they just did, yes.

MS. DIAMONSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: But I think you may even want to consider going one step further, even if you have to pull back from it.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: You have to go? Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. SMITH: Thank you for your time. We are talking about implementing over 20 years with a number of agencies and with the private sector where we can. So it's not one big --

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Great. Thanks a lot.

(Whereupon, at 3:05 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. 20560
TEL. 202.357.4880
FAX 202.633.9105

Freer Gallery of Art

EXHIBIT I

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Commission of Fine Arts, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles Lang Freer, have examined the following:

197.11 ***Painting, hanging scroll; Kuchibeni***
Artist: Gion Seitoku (1781-1829)
Ink and color on paper
Japan; Edo period, early 19th c.
Purchase consideration
(V3.97)

97.12 ***Painting, hanging scroll: Daruma***
Artist: Fugai Ekun (1568-1650)
Ink on paper
Japan; Edo period,17th c.
Gift consideration
(V7.97)

97.13 ***Lobed dish***
Metalwork: Silver
Central Asia, Sogdia; 7th century
Purchase consideration
(V11.97)

97.14 ***Painting, hanging scroll; Chrysanthemums and Poem***
Artist: Otagaki Rengetsu (1791-1875)
Ink and color on paper
Japan; Edo or Meiji period, ca. 1850-75
Purchase consideration
(V17.97.1)

197.15 ***Painting, hanging scroll; Poppies and Butterfly***
Artist: Suzuki Kiitsu (1796-1858)
Ink and colors on silk
Japan
Purchase consideration
(V17.97.2)

1.10 *Painting, hanging scroll: Susano'o no Mikoto Slaying a Serpent*
Artist: Kimura Ritsugaku (1827-90)
Ink, color, and gold on silk
Japan; Meiji Period, 1890
Transfer from the Study Collection
(FSC-PA-200)

END OF LIST

For the Commission of Fine Arts — *Date* 19.VI.97

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution — *Date* June 16, 1997